

# MYSORE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

THIRTEENTH DAY.

Friday, 18th March 1960.

The House met in the Assembly Hall, Vidhana Soudha, Bangalore, at One of the Clock.

MR. SPEAKER (SRI S. R. KANTHI, B.A., LL.B.) in the Chair.

## STARRED QUESTIONS

(to which oral answers were given)

### Nomination of the President of the Mysore Central Co-operative Land Mortgage Bank.

\*Q.—8. SRI T. PARTHASARATHY (Malleswaram).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) when the present President of the Mysore Central Co-operative Land Mortgage Bank Limited, was nominated;

(b) whether he was also the nominated President previously;

(c) whether the President resigned from the post about the middle of December 1956 to enable him to stand as a candidate for the Mysore Legislative Assembly elections held in 1957;

(d) whether the Bank had provided the President with a Phone during his appointment as President of the Bank;

(e) whether it is a fact that all the bills in connection with the calls made by the present President after his resignation and before he was re-appointed has been debited to the Bank itself;

(f) whether the Secretary of the said Bank is not a Government Gazetted Official whose services have been lent to the Bank;

(g) whether it is a fact that the official Secretary ordered the payment;

(h) what is the action taken by the Government against the Government official Secretary who made such payment and who took sides in the last elections?

A.—SRI MALI MARIYAPPA (Minister for Co-operation).—

(a) On 21 March 1957.

(b) Yes.

(c) Yes.

(d) Yes.

(e) Yes.

(f) Yes.

(g) Under examination.

(h) Under examination.

†SRI MALI MARIYAPPA.—The answers have to be modified slightly. So far as (c) is concerned, the resignation is in January 1957 and the purpose of resignation is not known. So far as (h) is concerned, for the first part of the question, 'under examination'; for the second part—there is another question included in that—'not known'.

SRI T. PARTHASARATHY.—You have accepted that payment for the telephone bills would be made in the interval between the resignation and re-nomination; Does it not amount to corruption?

† Indicates that the remarks or speeches have not been revised by the member concerned

**Sri MALI MARIYAPPA.**—It does not amount to corruption. That is why, it has been stated in reply to (g) that the matter whether it has been paid with the knowledge of the Secretary, etc., is under examination.

**Sri T. PARTHASARATHY.**—The telephone could have been disconnected immediately when he resigned the job.

**Sri MALI MARIYAPPA.**—Immediately there was a letter addressed to the Telephone Department to disconnect, but they did not immediately do it. There were two reminders also.

**Sri T. PARTHASARATHY.**—Where was the necessity of re-nominating the same individual after he resigned? Is it to help him to stand for election?

**Sri MALI MARIYAPPA.**—Since he was discharging his duties Satisfactorily, it was found that it was advisable to re-nominate him and so he was re-nominated.

**Sri B. S. SHANKARAPPA.**—Do you mean to say that there is no other person who can discharge the duties properly in the Central Mortgage Bank?

**Sri MALI MARIYAPPA.**—He is also one of the persons contemplated in your category of able persons.

**Sri B. S. SHANKARAPPA.**—Is it proper to re-nominate the same person?

**Sri MALI MARIYAPPA.**—It is within the discretion of the Government. If they find that he is discharging the duties correctly and efficiently, nothing prevents them from re-nominating him.

**Sri G. SIVAPPA.**—Is it not a fact that the Bank has satisfactorily progressed after he has been nominated to the institution as President?

**Sri MALI MARIYAPPA.**—I am glad to report that the collection has reached 99 per cent when he acted as President.

**Sri G. SIVAPPA.**—Is it not a fact that this amount which was paid by the Secretary in a short period is only Rs. 50 or 60?

**Sri MALI MARIYAPPA.**—Yes, it is a very petty amount.

**Sri T. PARTHASARATHY.**—Whether it be a rupee or Rs. 100, it amounts to corruption, if it is not legally used.

**Sri MALI MARIYAPPA.**—That is why we want to examine it; that is why we said that that matter was under examination.

**Sri T. PARTHASARATHY.**—If it is found that there is corruption will the Minister take action?

**Sri MALI MARIYAPPA.**—No question of corruption arises in this case.

**Sri T. PARTHASARATHY.**—How do you defend this act?

**Sri MALI MARIYAPPA.**—So far as the telephone connection is concerned, after his resignation, there was a letter addressed to the Telephone Department. They did not immediately remove the telephone; in the usual course, the Accountant would have made the payment. But we have been examining that matter whether it is with the knowledge of the Secretary or the Accountant or in the usual course that these bills would be paid. So no corruption arises in this case.

**ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಎಫ್. ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣ.**—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ. ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು 25 ನೆಯ ಜನವರಿ 1960 ಕ್ಕೆ ಕಳಿಸಿದೇ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಉತ್ತರ “under examination” ಎಂದಿದೆ. ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸದವರೆಗೆ ಇಪ್ಪುದಿವಸಗಳಲ್ಲಿ examination ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಾ, ರಿಜಲ್ಟು ಜನಾಗಿದೆ? ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ examination ಮಾಡದೇ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಏತಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲ?

**ಶ್ರೀ ಮಾಲ ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ.**—ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು 25ನೆಯ ಜನವರಿ 1960 ಕ್ಕೆ ಕಳಿಸಿರುವದೇನೋ ನಿಜ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಳಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸುವದಕ್ಕೆ ನಿಧಾನವಾಗಿದೆ. Examination ಮಾಡಿ ಯಾರು Payment ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಬೇಕು.

**Sri G. E. HOOVER.**—On what date the letter was addressed to the Telephone Department that the telephone should be disconnected?

**Sri MALI MARIYAPPA.**—In the month of February.

**Sri T. PARTHASARATHY.**—What was the interval between the resignation and the re-nomination?

**Sri MALI MARIYAPPA.**—On the 27th of January, the resignation has taken place and the re-nomination on the 21st of March 1957.

**Sri T. PARTHASARATHY.**—Was the telephone intact all the three months?

**Sri MALI MARIYAPPA.**—Not even two months.

**Sri M. RAMAPPA.**—In the written answer to (c), you have said ‘yes’; but now you say that the reason is not known. May I take it that it is an after-thought?

Sri MALI MARIYAPPA.—I have made a correction. You must have followed my answer earlier.

Sri M. RAMAPPA.—Why have you given in the printed answer that it was for the sake of contesting elections that he resigned?

Sri MALI MARIYAPPA.—In that question two things have been clubbed together. So it is better that we answer that question fully. The first part of the question relates to 'during what period he resigned' and in the second part of the same question, it is asked as to what is the purpose of his resignation and so these two things have been answered properly now.

#### Non-Accounting of Collections of Sanidevara Temple Jatra at Pavagada.

\*Q.—62. Sri G. N. PUTTANNA (Tumkur).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) whether it is a fact that the total collections at the Jatra of Sanidevara Temple at Pavagada will be about Rs. 30,000 per year;

(b) whether it is a fact that some of the donated amount is not accounted at all;

(c) whether it is a fact that the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur, ordered the Thasildar, Pavagada, on 26th January 1959 that all the amount collected, including Golaka collection, should be remitted to the Temple funds in the name of the Thasildar;

(d) whether it is a fact that the then Thasildar handed over Golaka and Jatra collection to S.S.K. Sangha disobeying the orders of the Deputy Commissioner; and if so, why and what action is taken against him?

A.—Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue).—

(a), (b), (c) & (d) The matter is *sub judice* and hence replies cannot be furnished.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎಫ್. ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣ.—ನೌವು, ಕಾಜು (a) (b), (c) & (d) ಎಲ್ಲದಕ್ಕೂ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡದೇ

ಈ ವಿಷಯ *sub judice* ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ಯಾವುದು *sub judice* ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ?

†Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—When the suit is pending before the District Judge it is very difficult to find out which is *sub judice* and which is not.

Sri G. N. PUTTANNA.—Sir, the question is:

“whether it is a fact that the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur, ordered the Thasildar, Pavagada, on 26th January 1959 that all the amount collected, including Golaka collection, should be remitted to the Temple funds in the name of the Thasildar.”

This matter is not at all a case before any court of law.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You cannot ask like that.

Sri G. N. PUTTANNA.—Clauses (c) and (d) do not form part of the suit before the District Judge. How can it be *sub judice*?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—It is not for me to say which is *sub judice* and which is not.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—The question is whether the Deputy Commissioner has ordered the Thasildar to do so or not. He can say yes or no.

Mr. SPEAKER.—According to the Minister it is *sub judice* and you have to accept it.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I can only say this much that the Deputy Commissioner had issued certain instructions to the Thasildar.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The first question is:

“whether it is a fact that the total collections at the Jatra of Sanidevara Temple at Pavagada will be about Rs. 30,000 per year.”

Surely this cannot be *sub judice*.

Mr. SPEAKER.—When the Government say that it is *sub judice* you cannot challenge the reply of Government.